

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3- 5, and 7 were pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 2, 6, and 8-9 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3- 5, and 7 were rejected.

Claims 1, 5, and 7 are hereby amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cariffe (US 6,281,872) in view of Barrett (US 5,301,036).

Independent claim 1 recites a print terminal comprising an image-processing unit configured to “simultaneously rotate both the print image and the print-medium image in a common direction.” Independent claims 5 and 7 recite similar features.

In setting forth the rejection, the Office acknowledges that Cariffe fails to disclose at least these features. See Office Action at page 3. The Office thus relies upon Barrett for these features. In particular, the Office asserts that Barrett discloses these features at Fig. 11 and at column 8, lines 36-50. See Office Action at page 4.

Barrett, however, does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Cariffe. Instead, in Fig. 11, Barrett merely shows a chart having a column that displays the orientation of images placed on copy sheets if the input images are oriented at 0°, a column that displays how the printed stock is usually used, and a column showing the required rotations. See Barrett at column 10, lines 8-26. Although Barrett illustrates a chart showing the differences between how the images are placed, and how the print stock is usually used, Barrett does not disclose or suggest providing an image-processing unit, which is configured to “simultaneously rotate both the print image and the print-medium image in a common direction,” as recited.

In addition, Barrett also does not disclose these features at column 8, lines 36-50, which is relied upon by the Office. Instead, Barrett merely describes Fig. 9, which illustrates a duplex output print selection with orientation selection. As such, for at least these reasons, Barrett fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Cariffe.

As discussed above, Cariffe and Barrett, taken individually, or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious at least the above-mentioned features, as recited. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

If the Examiner finds that there are any outstanding issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By: /David R. Metzger/

David Metzger, Reg. No. 32919
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
415-882-5064 (telephone)
415-882-0300 (facsimile)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT